WO

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF ARIZONA

Dominick Cestro,

Plaintiff,

v.

Navajo County, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CV-23-08608-PCT-JAT

ORDER

Pending before the Court is Plaintiff's motion to stay a case against him in Snowflake Justice Court. (Doc. 14). It is the Court's understanding that the case pending in state court is a traffic court case.

The *Younger* abstention doctrine provides that federal courts are not to interfere with pending state criminal proceedings. *See Younger v. Harris*, 401 U.S. 37 (1971). This abstention doctrine applies "not only when the pending state proceedings are criminal, but also when certain civil proceedings are pending, if the State's interests in the proceeding are so important that exercise of the federal judicial power would disregard the comity between the States and the National Government." *Pennzoil Co. v. Texaco, Inc.*, 481 U.S. 1, 11 (1987); *see Middlesex County Ethics Comm. v. Garden State Bar Ass'n*, 457 U.S. 423, 431 (1982) ("*Younger v. Harris*[], and its progeny espouse a strong federal policy against federal-court interference with pending state judicial proceedings absent extraordinary circumstances.").

Applying the Younger abstention doctrine, this Court will not stay Plaintiff's case

in Arizona state (Snowflake) justice court. Additionally, as discussed in a prior order, Plaintiff has filed an amended complaint. (Docs. 12, 13). Plaintiff has not yet served any Defendant named in the amended complaint. The Court also cannot issue what would amount to a preliminary injunction without notice to the Defendants. See Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 65(a)(1). Therefore, Plaintiff must first serve the Defendants named in the amended complaint before any relief can be obtained in this case. For the foregoing reasons, IT IS ORDERED that Plaintiff's motion to stay his state court case (Doc. 14) is denied. Dated this 15th day of March, 2024. James A. Teilborg Senior United States District Judge